REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present Application. Applicants gratefully acknowledge that claims 5 and 10 would be allowable but for their dependence on a rejected base claim. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, and 13 have been amended, leaving claims 1-14 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment. Support for the amendment, "wherein a portion of the third electrode extends parallel to one of the data lines and partially overlaps the storage electrode line" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8 can be found throughout the specification and in Fig. 1, for example. In addition, claims 1, 2, 5-8 and 13 have been amended for clarity and proper antecedent basis, supported throughout the specification. Support for the amendment to claim 13 can be found at least in the Specification as originally filed on page 4, line 2. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of at least the above amendments and the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner alleges that the title is not descriptive and states that a new title clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed is required.

The Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 1 recites a thin film transistor array panel and claim 8 recites a liquid crystal display. Because the title, which recites, "Liquid Crystal Display And Panel Therefor" is indicative of independent claims 1 and 8, the Applicants respectfully assert that the title is indicative of the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objects to claim 7 for reciting "contract" and claim 13 for repeating "a first domain partitioning member." Claim 7 has been amended to recite, "contact" and claim 13 has been amended to delete repeated text. In view of the above amendments, withdrawal of the objection and prosecution on the merits are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being allegedly anticipated by Song (U.S. Patent No. 7,460,191, hereinafter "Song"). The Examiner states that Song discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in Figs. 9-11. (Office Action dated August 26, 2009, p. 3-5) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the

following reasons.

To anticipate a claim, a reference must disclose each and every limitation of the claim. *Lewmar Marine v. Varient Inc.*, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements "arranged as in the claim." *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1274 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Missing elements may not be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art or the disclosure of another reference. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 780, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

The Applicants disclose that a portion of coupling electrode 176 extends parallel to data lines 171 and that a portion of coupling electrode 176 partially overlaps the storage electrode line. (Fig. 1, for example) Accordingly, claim 1, and similarly claim 8, has been amended to recite, *inter alia,* "wherein a portion of the third electrode extends parallel to one of the data lines and partially overlaps the storage electrode line."

Song does not disclose or suggest a thin film transistor array panel or a liquid crystal display wherein a portion of the third electrode extends parallel to one of the data lines and partially overlaps the storage electrode line. Song discloses connection electrode 74, which the Examiner alleges corresponds to a coupling electrode. (Detailed Action dated August 26, 2009, p. 4) The connection electrode 74 of Song partially overlaps storage capacitor line 30 of Song and electro-magnetically interconnects first and second pixel electrodes 91 and 92 of Song. (Song, col. 9, lines 49-51 and Fig. 9) Because Song does not disclose or suggest a thin film transistor array panel or liquid crystal display wherein a portion of the third electrode extends parallel to one of the data lines and partially overlaps the storage electrode line, as recited in amended independent claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 8, Song does not anticipate claims 1 and 8.

Claims 2-7 and 14 depend from amended independent claim 1, and thus include the allowable elements of claim 1, and claims 9-13 depend from amended independent claim 8, and thus include the allowable elements of claim 8. Therefore dependent claims 2-4, 6-7, 9 and 11-14 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above for amended independent claims 1 and 8.

Accordingly, reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and allowance of the instant claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being allegedly anticipated by Hiraishi (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,450, hereinafter "Hiraishi"). The Examiner states that Hiraishi discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in Figs. 9, 16 and 17. (Detailed Action dated August 26, 2009, p. 5-7) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at

least the following reasons.

Hiraishi does not disclose or suggest a thin firm transistor array panel or a liquid crystal display wherein a portion of the third electrode extends parallel to one of the data lines and partially overlaps the storage electrode line. Hiraishi discloses upper-layer pixel electrode 114, which the Examiner states overlaps an additional capacitance ("Cs") line 104. (Hiraishi, Fig. 16) Because Hiraishi does not disclose or suggest a thin film transistor array panel or liquid crystal display wherein a portion of the third electrode extends parallel to one of the data lines and partially overlaps the storage electrode line, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 8, Hiraishi does not anticipate claims 1 and 8.

Claims 2-7 and 14 depend from amended independent claim 1, and thus include the allowable elements of claim 1, and claims 9-13 depend from amended independent claim 8, and thus include the allowable elements of claim 8. Therefore the dependent claims are patentable over Hiraishi for at least the reasons given above for amended independent claims 1 and 8.

Accordingly, reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of the instant claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Song in view of Mimura (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,566, hereinafter "Mimura") as stated on pages 7-8 of the Office Action dated August 26, 2009. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

First Song is not available as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Section 103(c)(1) provides that:

> Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.
> 35 U.S.C. § 103(c)(1).

Applicants herewith submit a certified English translation of the priority document, thereby perfecting the claim to priority to the earlier filed Korean Application, Korean Patent Application No. 10-2003-0018787, which was filed on March 26, 2003. Song was filed on July 25, 2002 and published on May 22, 2003. Applicants respectfully submit that the present application properly antedates the publication date of the Song reference. Therefore Song qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

As set forth below, Song and the present application were owned by, or subject to an

obligation of assignment to the same entity, Samsung Electronics, Co. Ltd., at the time the claimed invention was made. Because Song and the present application were commonly owned at the time the claimed invention was made, per § 103(c) Song is disqualified as prior art for the purposes of an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Furthermore it is respectfully noted that claim 14 depends from amended independent claim 1, which is allowable for defining over Song as discussed above. It is also respectfully submitted that the use of *a storage bridge* as allegedly disclosed in Mimura, or any other disclosure of Mimura, does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Song.

Therefore claim 14 is patentable over Song in view of Mimura. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Song in view of Mimura.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Hiraishi in view of Mimura as stated on page 8 of the Office Action dated August 26, 2009. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

It is respectfully noted that claim 14 depends from amended independent claim 1, which is allowable for defining over Hiraishi as discussed above. Furthermore it is respectfully submitted that the use of *a storage bridge* as allegedly disclosed in Mimura, or any other disclosure of Mimura, does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Hiraishi.

Therefore claim 14 is patentable over Hiraishi in view of Mimura. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hiraishi in view of Mimura.

Statement of Common Ownership

Song (U.S. Patent No.7,460,191) and the present application were owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same entity at the time the claimed invention was made.

Conclusion

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection(s) and rejection(s) and allowance of the case are respectfully requested.

Applicants hereby petition for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) or any other necessary fees(s), which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

If there are any additional charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' Attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By /James J. Merrick/

James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
Grant M. Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Registration No. 56,185
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103-3207
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413

Date: November 30, 2009